

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 13, 15-22, and 24-38 are pending in this application. Claims 1-12, 14 and 23 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 13, 22, and 31 are independent. Claim 38 is added. Claims 13, 22 and 31 have been amended by way of this response; although these claims have been amended herein to provide clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices, Applicants submit that the originally filed claims are patentable and reserve the right to pursue the originally filed claims (as well as any claims dependent therefrom) at a later time and/or in one or more continuation/divisional application(s). Applicants submit that support for these new claims and claim amendments may be found throughout the originally filed specification, drawings and claims and that no new matter has been added by way of this Amendment/Response.

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the Office Action, the cited references, and the pending claims on November 6, 2009. Applicants submit that the foregoing claim amendments to independent claims 13, 22 and 31, and new independent claim 38 are based on the discussion.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 13, 15-22 and 24-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Barros (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,573, hereinafter, "Barros") in view of Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,593, hereafter "Williams"), and further in view of the

alleged Applicant's own admitted prior art of corporate entities. Although Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections and submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness and that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least the following reasons, Applicants have amended independent claim 13, 22 and 31 to provide further clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices.

MPEP § 706.02(j) prescribes that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should set forth:

- (i) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon,
- (ii) the differences in the claim over the applied references,
- (iii) the proposed modification of the applied references to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and
- (iv) an explanation as to why the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Applicants submit that the rejections in the pending Office Action do not establish at least the first two requirements, the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, as well as the differences in the claim over the applied references.

In the pending rejection, the Examiner alleges:

The term "corporate entity" as disclosed in the specification is merely directed towards an entity which is a selectable element presented in a graphical user interface. For purposes of this rejection the term "corporate" is non-functional descriptive material in that any entity will suffice for purposes of showing the disclosed function in the cited prior art.

(p. 3, ¶ 3, Office Action)

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the claimed elements are patentable subject matter despite the Examiner's allegations to the contrary. Applicants submit

that the claimed "corporate entity" is discussed and supported throughout the drawings, specification and claims, and is not an arbitrary "... selectable element presented in a graphical user interface" as alleged by the Examiner. Applicants submit that the claimed elements are clearly set forth, as is the operative relationship between the claim elements as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that in accordance with MPEP 2106.01, operative descriptive language is to be accorded patentable substantive weight and substantively examined.

However, to expedite the prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 13, 22 and 31 to provide further clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices. Amended independent claim 13 recites, *inter alia*:

A processor-implemented method comprising:

...

accessing via a processor, corporate information of a plurality of selectable corporate entities, wherein the corporate information includes at least ownership information, legal documents information and contact information relating to each corporate entity;

...

Applicants submit that the Examiner's cited references, Barros, which provides "a computer system through extensive databases of diverse multimedia wherein information is presented on an interactive, keyed map ..." (col. 3, lns. 64-67, Barros) of geographical data. For example, Barros' Figures 7a-c show a "world map," a map of the "Pacific Ocean" and information of "Ecosystem of Hawaii's big island" (Figures 7a-c, Barros). As such, Applicants submit Barros' geographical data is different from the claimed "... accessing ... corporate information of a plurality of selectable corporate entities, wherein the corporate information includes at least ownership information, legal documents information and contact information relating to each corporate entity ..." as recited in amended independent claim 13.

Applicants further submit that Williams, which discusses an "novel database architectures useful for storing data in versatile formats that can be utilized by a wide range of software applications" (Abstract, Williams), fails to remedy the deficiencies in Barros as discussed above. As such, Applicants submit a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established with regard to independent claim 13.

Applicants submit that independent claim 13 and its corresponding dependent claims 15-21 are therefore believed to be patently distinct from the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 22 and its dependent claims 24-30, as well as amended independent claim 31 and its dependent claims 32-37, although different in scope, are patently distinct from the prior art for at least similar reasons to the deficiencies identified in Barros and Williams with regard to independent claim 13. Applicants submit therefore, that for at least the foregoing reasons, amended independent claims 22 and 31 and their respective dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. Although of different scope, Applicants further submit that new independent claim 38 is also patentable for at least similar reasons discussed above and is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of these grounds of the rejections, and allowance of the pending claims.

### CONCLUSION

In summary, Applicants submit that independent claims 13, 22 and 31 are patently distinct from the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above. Dependent claims 15-21, 24-30 and 32-37 are also patently distinct for the cited references for at least the reasons cited above. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the supporting remarks and claimed

inventions, 13, 15-22 and 24-38, all: overcome all rejections and/or objections as noted in the office action, are patentable over and discriminated from the cited reference(s), and are in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants believe that the above remarks, which distinguish the claims over the cited reference(s), pertained only to noted claim element portions. These remarks are believed to be sufficient to overcome the prior art. While many other claim elements and/or bases for rejection were not discussed as they have been rendered moot based on the above amendments and/or remarks, Applicants assert that all such remaining and/or not discussed claim elements, all, also are distinguished over the prior art and reserves the opportunity to more particularly remark and distinguish such remaining claim elements at a later time should it become necessary. Further, any remarks that were made in response to an Examiner objection and/or rejection as to any one claim element, and which may have been re-asserted as applying to another Examiner objection and/or rejection as to any other claim element(s), any such re-assertion of remarks is not meant to imply that there is commonality about the structure, functionality, means, operation, and/or scope of any of the claim elements, and no such commonality is admitted as a consequence of any such re-assertion of remarks. As such, Applicants do not concede that any claim elements have been anticipated and/or rendered obvious by any of the cited reference(s). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection(s) and/or objection(s) and allowance of all claims.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

#### **AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 03-1240 Order No. 17209-324.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17209-324.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHADBOURNE & PARKE, L.L.P.

Dated: December 7, 2009

By: /Daniel C. Sheridan/  
Daniel C. Sheridan, Reg. No. 53,585

Chadbourne & Parke LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112  
212-408-5100 Telephone  
212-541-5369 Facsimile